

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JOHN D. GLENN, JR.,

Defendant.

CRIMINAL ACTION
NO. 15-99-1

ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th day of October 2015, upon consideration of the Government's Motion to Preclude Defendant from Using "Hybrid" Representation (Doc. No. 35), and the Government's unopposed Motion for a Continuance of Trial (Doc. No. 40), it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Government's Motion to Preclude Defendant from Using "Hybrid" Representation (Doc. No. 35) is **GRANTED**.¹
2. Defendant's pro se Motions (Doc. Nos. 23-28, 34, 44) are **DENIED**.
3. The Government's Motion for a Continuance of Trial (Doc. No. 40) is **GRANTED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.

¹ Defendant has no right to "hybrid" representation, which is simultaneous "representation . . . pro se and by counsel." Hall v. Dorsey, 534 F. Supp. 507, 508 (E.D. Pa. 1982); see also McKaskle v. Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168, 183 (explaining that a defendant does not have "a constitutional right to choreograph" appearances by counsel and his own pro se representation). Therefore, Defendant may not file his pro se Motions (Doc. Nos. 23-28, 34) while he is represented by counsel. In addition, the Court has already continued the trial date of this case (Doc. No. 41) in accordance with Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial Date (Doc. No. 49). The Government, in its Motion for a Continuance (Doc. No. 40), seeks the same continuance, which will be granted.